

Appl. No. 10/680,345
Response dated Oct. 24, 2008

Reply to Office Action of July 31, 2008

Amendment to the Claims:

The listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

Claim 1 (Currently Amended):

A method of personalizing user call features in a policy-based management system for a telephony call processing system in a communication system, comprising:

receiving a user-entered policies call feature policy entered in a natural language that is in a representation understandable to naïve a users- and capable of translation into a formal-executable language;

translating said policies policy from said ~~representation~~ natural language into an executable feature language capable of execution by said ~~communication-telephony call processing~~ system;

translating said policies policy from said executable feature language into a policy conflict detection language and detecting common feature interaction errors in said policy or between said policy and other policies;

translating said feature interaction errors from said policy conflict detection language to said natural language that is understandable to the user and reporting said errors to the user;

~~analyzing said feature interaction errors to identify errors that are common to naïve users;~~

~~reporting said errors that are common to the user in said user-understandable representation;~~

providing the user with a recommendation ~~in said representation understandable to the naïve users~~ for correction of said feature interaction errors and re-integration of said policies policy in said executable feature language; and

uploading said policies policy for execution by said ~~communication-telephony call processing~~ system,

whereby said policy is personalized and local to only said user.

Appl. No. 10/680,345
Response dated Oct. 24, 2008

Reply to Office Action of July 31, 2008

Claim 2 (Currently Amended): The method of claim 1, wherein said ~~representation~~ is user enters said policy via a Web browser interface.

Claim 3 (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein said executable feature language is Call Processing Language (CPL).

Claim 4 (Currently Amended): The method of claim 1, wherein said policy conflict detection language is Feature Interaction Analysis Tool (FIAT).

Claim 5 (Currently Amended): The method of claim 1, wherein said step of receiving said user-entered call feature policy ~~policies in said representation~~ further comprises receiving user-entered operations on said policy ~~policies~~, including:

Create: for creating and activating a new policy;

Modify: for modifying a selected policy;

Delete: for deleting a selected policy;

Duplicate: for making a copy of a selected policy;

Deactivate: for deactivating a selected policy;

Activate: for activating a selected inactive policy;

Set Priority: for setting priority of a selected policy to one of either an absolute priority or a relative priority;

Validate: for detecting and reporting conflicts among active ones of said policies; and

Approve: for approving and enabling selected policies for execution.

Claim 6 (Original): The method of claim 1, wherein each said policy includes:

a name for use as a unique identifier;

a priority, expressed as a numerical value;

an operation, for application to a call within said communication system;

a precondition, based on characteristics of a caller or callee, whereby said policy is general in the event that the precondition is a domain of values, and is specialized in the event that the precondition relates to particular values;

a target, for said operation;

an optional list of exceptions to said precondition in the event that that said policy is general; and

a time constraint, during which the policy is active.

Appl. No. 10/680,345
Response dated Oct. 24, 2008

Reply to Office Action of July 31, 2008

Claim 7 (Original): The method of claim 6, wherein individual ones of said policies are translated into said executable feature language as scripts representing individual branches of a decision tree, with explicit priorities allocated among said branches.

Claim 8 (Original): The method of claim 7, wherein said priorities are allocated by numerically naming the individual branches.

Claim 9 (Currently Amended): The method of claim 8, wherein said step of translating said policies from said executable feature language into said policy conflict detection language further comprises visiting successive ones of said branches downwardly and producing corresponding rules, using the following mapping: name policy to name rule; priority policy to number rules; operation policy to result rule; precondition policy to triggering event rule; target policy to result rule; exceptions policy to constraint rule; and time constraints policy to precondition rule.

Claim 10 cancelled

Claim 11 (Currently Amended): The method of claim 10, wherein said step of reporting said errors further includes identifying a category of incoherence, assigning a role of each policy in the occurrences of said errors, and providing examples of possible misbehavior resulting from said feature interaction errors.

Claim 12 (Currently Amended): The method of claim 11, wherein said errors ~~that are common to the naïve users and are reported~~ in said reporting step comprise include:

Redundancy: whereby two general policies are active;

Shadowing: whereby a general policy overrides a specific policy such that the specific policy can never be triggered;

Specialization: whereby a specific policy is selected over a general policy of lower priority; and

Conflict: whereby two policies have overlapping preconditions but with different resulting actions.

Claim 13 (Original): The method of claim 12, wherein said Redundancy error Includes a Conflict with Redundancy error whereby a general policy and an exception for the other general policy lead to different resulting actions.

Appl. No. 10/680,345
Response dated Oct. 24, 2008

Reply to Office Action of July 31, 2008

Claim 14 (Previously Presented): The method of claim 13, wherein said step of providing the user with a recommendation for correction of said feature interaction errors includes the following suggestions:

- edit a policy;
- disable a policy;
- set the priority of a first policy above or below the priority of a second policy;
- add an exception to a general rule; and
- tolerate the interaction and no longer report the interaction.

Claims 15-28 (Cancelled)